

JAN 19 1911

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME IX

JANUARY 1911

NUMBER I

ON THE ANTIQUITY AND THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

The fundamental assertion of the Biblical doctrine of the origin of man is that he owes his being to a creative act of God. Subsidiary questions growing out of this fundamental assertion, however, have been thrown from time to time into great prominence, as the changing forms of current anthropological speculation have seemed to press on this or that element in, or corollary from, the Biblical teaching. The most important of these subsidiary questions has concerned the method of the Divine procedure in creating man. Discussion of this question became acute on the publication of Charles Darwin's treatise on the *Origin of Species* in 1859, and can never sink again into rest until it is thoroughly understood in all quarters that "evolution" cannot act as a substitute for creation, but at best can supply only a theory of the method of the Divine providence. Closely connected with this discussion of the mode of origination of man, has been the discussion of two further questions, both older than the Darwinian theory, to one of which it gave however a new impulse, while it has well-nigh destroyed all interest in the other. These are the questions of the Antiquity of Man and the Unity of the Human Race, to both of which a large historical interest attaches, though neither of them can be said to be burning questions of to-day.

The question of the antiquity of man has of itself no theological significance. It is to theology, as such, a matter of entire indifference how long man has existed on earth.

THE PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY AND CHILIASM.

The division of the eschatological future into two distinct stages, the one of a temporary, provisional, the other of an eternal, absolute character, is probably of pre-Christian Jewish origin. It is first met with in the Book of Enoch, Chaps. 91 and 93, the "vision of weeks", so called because it divides the entire course of the world into ten weeks. The eighth of these stands for the Messianic period, the ninth and the tenth bring the final judgment, and it is not until the close of the tenth week that the new creation appears. In the third book of the Jewish Sibyl (vss. 652-660) the Messianic kingdom is represented as subject to attack and destruction by the assembled nations, and after these are destroyed in turn, the kingdom of God begins. The dating of these two apocalyptic documents is somewhat uncertain, but a great preponderance of authorities places them in the pre-Christian period.¹ The same distinction between a preliminary Messianic and a final kingdom has been found in the Psalms of Solomon. Here in Psalms xvii and xviii the Messianic reign seems to be described as something transitory, for the Psalmist speaks not only of "his days", "those days" (xvii. 32, xviii. 6) but also of "his lifetime" (xvii. 37). On the other hand in Psalm iii. 12, we read of a resurrection to eternal life. It is not absolutely certain, however, that all the Psalms in this collection are of one author, in which case, to be sure, the idea of two successive kingdoms would offer the only explanation of the two varying descriptions of the future. If the authorship should not be the same, the necessity or warrant for introducing this

¹ Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*,⁴ III, 279 (uncertain about the vision of weeks), 555-592, Sibyl of the third book ab. 140 B. C. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums*,² p. 13, who dates the entire Enoch-literature between 164 and 80 B. C. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 28, Chaps. xci-civ, between 134-94 B. C., or possibly 104-94 B. C.

distinction here, would, it is urged, fall away, since the outlook of one author might be entirely confined to the Messianic era *sub specie temporis*, whilst another might contemplate the same era as of eternal duration.² Even so, however, it seems unlikely that the former writer should have consciously regarded the Messianic era as something temporal and temporary without putting the question to himself, what was to come beyond it. As in all other cases the idea of an endless, eternal kingdom of God is the correlate of the ascription of a limited duration to the Messianic kingdom, so it was probably in the mind of the writer of Psalms xvii and xviii in this collection.³ Coming down into the Christian period we meet the twofold kingdom in the Slavic Enoch and the great apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch, and here a definite number of years is fixed for the duration of the provisional Messianic reign. The Christ reigns according to 4 Ezra vii. 28 ff. four hundred years, then he, together with all other earthly creatures, dies, after which the dead awake and the eternal judgment begins. Similarly in xii. 34, where the reign of the Messiah lasts till the end of the world and the day of judgment. In the Slavic Enoch and Baruch the limited duration of the Messianic era is connected with the system of world-periods. In the latter apocalypse, after the description of the Messianic kingdom in Chap. xxix, the opening verse of the following chapter states that when the period of the arrival of the Messiah has been completed he will return in glory into heaven,⁴ which return will be the signal for the resurrection of those who are fallen asleep in hoping for him. While Chap. xl. 3 represents the reign of the Messiah as "permanent for ever", this is immediately qualified by the subjoined clause "until the world devoted to destruction

² So Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums*,² p. 331, Note 1.

³ It does not, of course, follow that the author of Psalm iii held the same distinction. He might have conceived the Messianic reign as eternal or his conception of "eternal life" might have been un-Messianic. Only if we identify him with the author of Psalms xvii and xviii, can we affirm that the eschatology of the latter was also his.

⁴ Literally: "will turn himself back." Cf. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, II, p. 423.

comes to a close, and the times named above fulfill themselves". Finally according to Chap. lxxiv. 2 the Messianic age is "the end of that which is transitory, and the beginning of that which is non-transitory".

In regard to the motive underlying the development of this conception of a provisional Messianic kingdom it has been suggested by recent writers that it is of the nature of a compromise between two heterogeneous eschatological schemes, the ancient national-political, terrestrial scheme, which revolves around the destiny of Israel, and the later transcendental, cosmical scheme, which has in view the consummation of the world as such and the introduction of altogether new conditions on a super-mundane plane. At first the ideas and expectations connected with these two schemes formed an orderless mass, a conglomerate without adjustment or correlation. The most varying elements lay unreconciled and unreconcilable in close proximity to each other. Such is the case in the older parts of the Book of Enoch and in the Book of Jubilees. Or the semblance of coherence was saved by bringing into the foreground only one of these two aspects of the eschatological hope, leaving the other in obscurity, while not denying its right of existence. Thus in the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch, and in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs the prevailing atmosphere is of the transcendental, super-terrestrial kind, although not to the entire exclusion of the earthly, national, political prospects. On the other hand in such writings as the Psalter of Solomon⁵ and the Assumption of Moses the eschatological drama plays itself out mainly on the stage of this world and under temporal conditions, the interest being centered on Israel. Rarely, as in the Slavic Book of Enoch, does the spirit of other-worldliness become so dominant as to expel all the heterogeneous elements belonging to the other and lower plane. In most cases the contradictions were not actually removed but only covered up by the distribution of emphasis. And for this reason, it was inevit-

⁵This on the old interpretation of the Psalms, according to which they do not contain the doctrine of a provisional Messianic Kingdom. See above.

able, it is thought, that a more systematic attempt should in course of time be made to bring not only apparent but real order into the confusion. This was done through the distribution of the various elements over two successive periods. The older, national, political, earthly hopes, it was now believed, would first go into fulfilment and thus have full justice done to them. But this would last for a time only. Then, after this tribute to the ancient hopes of Israel had been paid, the new order of things could assume its eternal, cosmical sway, no longer hindered in the unfolding of its transcendental character by the intrusion of interests or forces of a less exalted type.

Sometimes, as notably in the case of Bousset, this view with regard to the origin of the Chiliastic hope is coupled with the hypothesis according to which the whole higher, transcendental eschatology of Judaism, the specific apocalyptic ideas about the future, are not a native growth on the soil of the Old Testament, but an importation from Babylonian, or ultimately Persian sources. But this peculiar assumption, so grave and far-reaching in its consequences,⁶ is by no means essential to the theory. Whether the latter shall be accepted or rejected is a question to be decided on its own merits. The cleavage and heterogeneity which mark the Jewish eschatology, would, if actually present to the contemporary consciousness, invite attempts at readjustment and reduction to system quite as much in case the disharmony was due to indigenious development as if it was due to the intrusion of foreign influence. But apart from this, and considering the problem altogether by itself, we are not convinced that the solution offered, attractive though it may seem, is borne out by the facts. The origin of a scheme does not always coincide with the uses to which

⁶It carries with it the inference that the basis and background of the entire Christian doctrine of salvation are of pagan origin. The question about the origin of the apocalyptic eschatology resolves itself into a question of the antecedents of the specifically soteriological element in Christianity. For the soteriology rests throughout on the eschatology.

it may subsequently be put. When as far back as the period of canonical prophetism we find the twofold representation, on the one hand that the eschatological order of things will be called into being by the appearance of a Messianic king, on the other hand that this order will be brought into existence by the appearance and kingly interposition of God Himself, so that the new conceptions of a kingdom of the Messiah and a kingdom of God appear at this early stage side by side without any attempt at adjustment, then it would seem that in this primitive, prophetic diversity we have a fully adequate explanation of the origin of the idea of the two successive kingdoms. Where once the problem inherent in this twofold perspective had made itself felt, it certainly required no profound reflection to perceive that the easiest way of solving the difficulty lay in making the two forms of the future state follow each other, in which case the first in order would be naturally the kingdom of the Messiah, to be followed by the kingdom of God as the absolute consummation of all things. Chiliasts, who should want to resent the charge of the dependence of their favorite idea on the dualism and disorder created in the eschatology of the Old Testament by the streaming in of a pagan system of ideas, can make out a good case for themselves on the ground indicated. Whether the New Testament stamps with its approval the solution, which on such a view, the early Jewish theology brought to bear on the old problem, or has a different solution of its own, may remain an open question. But a charge of being rooted in paganism rather than in study of the Old Testament need not lie against Chiliasm.

From the presumable origin of the distinction we must, however, keep separated the use to which in course of time it came to be put. In itself the distinction between a preliminary Messianic and a subsequent divine kingdom is indifferent to eschatological tone or atmosphere.^{6a} In the earlier

^{6a} This may be seen most clearly from the Slavic Enoch, in which, as Bousset observes, the atmosphere is pervasively transcendental, and which yet (for the first time) limits the Messianic kingdom to a thousand years.

sources the Messianic kingdom is not depicted in particularly glowing sensualistic colors, as though a conscious effort had been made to save in it realistic hopes and dreams for which it was felt the transcendental outlook left no room, nor, on the other hand, is the final state described in such super-sensual terms as to carry the impression, that an order of things so constituted is utterly incommensurable with the substance of the old, earthly, national expectations. It is not in Enoch, and not in the well known verses from the third book of the Sibyl, nor in the Psalter of Solomon that the picture of the provisional Messianic kingdom assumes the complexion which is usually called "chiliastic" in the specific sense of the word, but first in the great apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch this is the case. According to 4 Ezra vii. 28, God's son, the Christ, when he is revealed will "disperse joy to those that remain for four hundred years". The same prospect of "joy" for those "left in the land" recurs in xii. 24. The most typical passage is Baruch xxix. 1-8: When the Messiah begins to reveal himself, Behemoth and Leviathan likewise appear and are given as food to the remnant; the earth produces ten thousandfold; a vine will have one thousand branches, every branch one thousand clusters, every cluster one thousand grapes, and every grape will yield one kor of wine; winds will proceed from God and will carry to the people the fragrance of the aromatic fruit and every night clouds will distill healing dew; the heavenly supplies of manna will be let down and they will eat of them in those years because they have reached the end of the ages.⁷ Characteristic also is lxxiv. 1: "In these days the reapers will not have to exert themselves, and those that build will not have to toil, for of themselves all works will have progress together with those who labor thereon with much rest." And it is precisely in these latest apocalypses that the final state appears at the farthest remove from the conditions of earthly existence even in an idealized form.

⁷This is the passage from which Papias is believed to have borrowed his well-known description of the Chiliastic state, quoted in Irenaeus V, 33, 3.

It is not a perfection of the present life, but a transposal of life into the supernatural that is expected. There can be little doubt that a sense of the incompatibility of such a state with the Messianic joys as ordinarily conceived, contributed to sharpen the distinction between the two successive kingdoms and to make it one not merely of chronology but chiefly of character.

The Pauline eschatology in point of date lies between the older documents in which the Chiliastic view appears and this later efflorescence of it in 4 Ezra and Baruch. It is not surprising, therefore, that attempts should have been made to bring Paul in line with the general apocalyptic development on this point, by making him teach the future coming of some such temporary kingdom of the Christ as the Jewish sources assume.⁸ The traces of this,—for at the best it is only traces of such teaching that have supposedly been found—are all connected with the Apostle's doctrine of the resurrection. The analogy of the well-known passage in Rev. xx. has undoubtedly led interpreters to look for the idea by preference in that quarter. It is affirmed that Paul expects a double resurrection, one of a certain class of dead at the Parousia, and that of the remaining dead at the consummation of the world before the judgment, and that he places the glorious reign of Christ between these two resurrections.⁹ Now it will be observed, that the idea of Chiliasm, when introduced in this concrete form, which is, as a

⁸So Grimm, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1873, pp. 380-411; Schmiedel in Holtzmann's *Handkommentar*,² II, p. 196, Kabisch, *Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht und ihre Beziehung zur jüdischen Apokalypt.*, pp. 111, 112; Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums*,² p. 331. Among more recent writers the presence of Chiliasm in Paul is denied by Titius, *Die Neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit, Der Paulinismus*, p. 47; Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity*, p. 386, and Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, pp. 322-324.

⁹Where the doctrine of a universal resurrection is denied to Paul, the judgment alone would have to mark the close of the provisional kingdom, and the resurrection, in its form of a resurrection of believers only, would fall at the beginning of the kingdom.

matter of fact, the only form for which any semblance of support can be found in the Pauline Epistles, does not particularly fit into the development of the doctrine in Jewish Apocalyptic. It would represent a more advanced form of the idea than is met with in 4 Ezra and Baruch, inasmuch as the differentiation between the two kingdoms has been carried through to the point of a distinction between two resurrections. In the two above-named apocalypses the resurrection is not yet divided, but remains fixed to its accustomed place immediately before the final judgment.¹⁰ The Pauline teaching then would in this respect not be in continuity with the apocalyptic development of doctrine, but overtake and pass on beyond it. Still it might be urged, that this particular departure can be explained from the specifically Christian premise, that the Messiah has already come, and that in him, that is at a central point, the resurrection has already become an accomplished fact, so that naturally, when between this fundamental resurrection and the final resurrection the Chiliastic kingdom as a separate future stage is inserted, this intermediate stage must also, like the first and the last epoch, have a resurrection connected with itself. In some such way at least the strangeness of such a departure from the more prevalent apocalyptic tradition could be softened down and the theory of a real connection on the main point be upheld.

It must be admitted, however, that the likelihood of finding Chiliasm in Paul is not favored by the trend of the Apostle's teaching as a whole. Not merely does his general concatenation of eschatological events, in which the Parousia and the resurrection of believers are directly combined with the judgment, exclude any intermediate stage of protracted duration.¹¹ It is of even more importance

¹⁰The passage quoted above from 4 Ezra vii. 28: "My Son the Messiah will reveal himself with all those that are with him" does not refer to a provisional resurrection but to the appearance of certain eminent saints with the Christ from heaven.

¹¹Cf. 1 Thess. i. 10; ii. 17; iii. 13; v. 9, 23; 2 Thess. i. 10; ii. 12, 13. In point of fact the Chiliastic doctrine runs so contrary to the Apostle's teaching as a whole that its assumed appearance in 1 Cor. xv. 24 and

to note that Paul conceives of the present Christian state on so high a plane, that nothing less or lower than the absolute state of the eternal consummate kingdom appears worthy to be its sequel. To represent it as followed by some intermediate condition falling short of the perfect heavenly life would be in the nature of an anti-climax.

More and more it begins to be recognized that according to the Apostle's teaching the Christian life is semi-eschatological. It partakes in principle of the powers and privileges of the world to come. The most fundamental way of affirming this is by ascribing to the Christian a "spiritual" state of existence, for the *πνεῦμα* is the characteristic element of the heavenly life of the *αἰῶν μέλλον*. The principle in question has nothing to do with the nearness or remoteness of what we call the second coming of our Lord. It is not chronological contiguity, but causal nexus and identity of religious privilege that most closely link together the present and the life of eternity. Along many lines the influence of this idea as determinative of the Apostle's thought can be clearly shown. We must not forget that in the Apostle's view the resurrection, an integral part of the eschatological process, had already taken place in principle, viz., in the resurrection of Christ. Christ was the "first-fruits" of the resurrection that belongs to the end. And, though not as regards the body, yet as regards the spirit, this resurrection of Christ as a beginning of eternal life, already works in believers. The Christian has in principle been raised with Christ. And as the resurrection is anticipated in the springing up of new life in the believer, so the other great eschatological act, the judgment is in a sense anticipated in justification, since the latter partakes of all the comprehensiveness and absoluteness that pertain to the final sentence of God in the last

Phil. iii. has been construed by some writers as prima facie evidence of the interpolated character of the former passage (So Michelsen, *Theol. Tydschr.* 1877, pp. 215-221 and Bruins, *ibid.* 1892, pp. 381-415) and of spuriousness of the Epistle to the Philippians (So Hoekstra, *Theol. Tydschr.* 1875, pp. 442-450).

day. Even the death of Christ means to Paul, among other things, the judgment in that more realistic Old Testament sense of the destruction of the powers arrayed against God, and in so far is another act of the eschatological drama already performed.¹² The idea of *σωτηρία* is with Paul originally an eschatological idea: it denotes salvation in the day of judgment, salvation from the wrath to come, and from this it is transferred to the present state, inasmuch as the believer receives this immunity, this deliverance in principle now.¹³ It is thus of the very essence of salvation that it correlates the Christian's standing with the great issues of the last day and the world to come. Hence also the *καινή κτίσις* spoken of in 2 Cor. v. 17, undoubtedly means to the Apostle the personal beginning of that world-renewal in which all eschatology culminates: "If any one is in Christ, he is a new creation".

The point we wish to emphasize in all this is, that Paul throughout represents the present Christian life as so directly leading up to, so thoroughly pre-fashioning the life of the eternal world, that the assumption of a *tertium quid* separating the one from the other must be regarded as destructive of the inner organism of his eschatology. For it will be observed that what the Christian life anticipates is according to the above survey, in each case something of an absolute nature, something pertaining to the consummate state. No matter with what concrete elements or colors the conception of a Chiliastic state may be filled out, to a mind thus nourished upon the first-fruits of eternal life itself, it can, for the very reason that it must fall short of eternal life, have neither significance nor attraction.

Still such general considerations do not absolve us from the duty of testing the exegetical evidence adduced in support of the view in question. There are not lacking those who fully agree with us as to the general structure of the

¹² Cf. Col. ii. 15; Rom. viii. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 6, where notice the Partic. Pres. *καταργουμένων*: the rulers of this world are already coming to nought.

¹³ Cf. 1 Thess. v. 9; Rom. v. 9.

Pauline eschatology but who, on exegetical grounds, feel constrained to assume that by the introduction of a Chiliastic element the Apostle has involved himself in a palpable contradiction. The passages in which Chiliasm has been found are chiefly four, 1 Cor. xv. 23-28; 1 Thess. iv. 13-18; 2 Thess. i. 5-12; and Phil. iii. 10-14. We will examine these in succession. In connection with the passage in 1 Corinthians the argument for the Chiliastic interpretation may be briefly stated as follows: It is urged, first of all, that in the statement of vs. 22 "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive", the πάντες must be taken without restriction, of all men: "As in Adam all men die, so also in Christ all men shall be made alive". This necessitates, it is further said, since οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ of vs. 23 does not exhaust the πάντες, the assumption that vs. 24 speaks of a subsequent stage in the resurrection. The words εἶτα τὸ τέλος are therefore taken to mean: "Then comes the end (the final stage) of the resurrection". It is with reference to these successive stages that the Apostle writes in vs. 23: "Each in his own order". There are two orders, τάγματα: first those that are Christ's at His Parousia, secondly the end of the resurrection (that is the raising of the remainder of men) when He delivers up the kingdom to God, even the Father. And, as in the first statement the words "at his Parousia" are added to designate the time when this first act will occur, so in the second the words "when he delivers up the kingdom" are added to fix the point of time for the last act.

The first resurrection takes place at the Parousia, the second when Christ abdicates His kingdom. This, of course, involves that the two points of time referred to do not coincide but are separated by an interval of shorter or longer duration. Just as between the ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός and the ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ there lies a period marked by ἔπειτα, so between ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ and τὸ τέλος Paul places a period and marks this by εἶτα (εἶτα τὸ τέλος.). That there are three successive acts to be distinguished in the resurrection, follows also, it is believed, from the use of the

term *τάγμα* "each in his own *τάγμα*". This distributive way of speaking implies that there is more than one *τάγμα*, and, since Christ in His resurrection stands alone and cannot form a *τάγμα* by Himself, it is plain that there must be two *τάγματα* besides Him. The one is the *τάγμα* of those that are Christ's at His coming, the other the *τάγμα* at the end. That the time elapsing between the resurrection of believers and the final resurrection must be a protracted period is said to be implied by the second *ὅταν* in vs. 24. The first *ὅταν* merely names in the Present Subjunctive the *point* of time *when* the final resurrection takes place, *ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ* "when he *delivers* up the kingdom to God"; the second *ὅταν* names in the Aorist Subjunctive the *period after* which the final resurrection will occur, *ὅταν κατηργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν* "when he *shall have abolished* all rule." In other words Paul not merely implies that there will be a period between the resurrection of believers and that of the others, but also conceives of this period as the kingdom of Christ specifically, in distinction from the kingdom of God, which is to follow after, and he moreover affirms that this specific future, inter-resurrection kingdom of Christ will have for its concrete content the progressive subjugation of the enemies described as *ἀρχαί*, *ἐξουσίαι* and *δυνάμεις*.

Having now the proposed exegesis before us we perceive at a glance, that it seems to commend itself by that most popular of credentials, surface simplicity. But, as is frequently the case, the difficulties lie beneath the surface. To begin with the argument derived from *πάντες* in vs. 22. There is an insurmountable obstacle to understanding this of "all men" in the fact that the *ζωοποιεῖσθαι* of the *πάντες* is represented as taking place *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*. How can this apply to the second resurrection at the end? There are two answers offered us, but they are both equally unacceptable on the basis of the general teaching of Paul. The one is that offered by Meyer and Godet. They propose to give to *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* such a weakened sense as to make

it equally applicable to the resurrection of the lost and of believers. Thus Meyer interprets the phrase in question to mean that "in Christ lies the ground and cause why at the final historical completion of His redemptive work death . . . shall be removed again and all shall be made alive." And Godet asks: "May it not be said of those who shall rise to condemnation, that they also shall rise in Christ? . . . The Saviour having once appeared, it is on their relation to Him that the lot of all depends for weal or woe; it is this relation consequently which determines their return to life, either to glory or to condemnation." We submit that this is an utterly un-Pauline interpretation of the phrase *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*. Wherever this occurs in Paul's Epistles it is always meant in the full sense of a soteriological, if not always pneumatic, in-being in Christ. Especially a *ζωοποιεῖν* which takes place in Christ, must needs be mediated by the Spirit, just as the *ἀποθνήσκειν ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ* implies a real union between him and the *πάντες* who die. This road therefore is impassable. The other way of relieving the difficulty, that after those who are Christ's have been raised, still others shall be raised *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*, is to assume that Paul here rises to the height of belief in an *ἀποκατάστασις πάντων* i. e., to the height of absolute universalism. At the second resurrection those will be raised, who at the time of the first resurrection, at the moment of the Parousia, were not yet "of Christ", but in the meantime have been converted and thus become proper subjects of a saving resurrection.¹⁴ But such an assumption, no less than the proposal of Meyer and Godet, is too palpably inconsistent with the most explicit teaching of the Apostle elsewhere to deserve serious consideration. The eternal destruction of the wicked is taught not only in the earlier epistles but in this very same epistle to the Corinthians and in the later letters, so that the difference cannot be placed to the account of a development in Paul's mind in

¹⁴ This is the view of Grimm, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1873, pp. 380-411, and of Schmiedel, *Handkommentar*, II, p. 196.

the direction of universalism. Nor do the words *ἵνα ἢ ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν πᾶσι* in vs. 28 require an absolutely universalistic interpretation. For these words refer to the bringing to nought of the enemies spoken of in vss. 24, 25 of whom the last is death. These enemies are designated *ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις, θάνατος*. They prevent until the end that God should be *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι*, that is, they interfere with the complete victorious sway of God over the universe; *ἐν πᾶσι* is neuter "in all things" = "in the universe". Full justice is done to these words when we interpret them of the breaking of the power of these enemies in the world. To be sure, it might be replied that, so long as any wicked men remain, the power of these superhuman enemies is not wholly broken, because the very existence of moral evil in part of mankind would prove its continuance; and that therefore, although *ἐν πᾶσι* be neuter, and do not affirm directly the conversion of all men, yet indirectly the unqualified subjection of the universe to God, and the total *καταργεῖσθαι* of these powers warrant the same conclusion. In answer to this we would say that, if the phrase *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι* is to be pressed to this extent, then Paul must have combined with it the idea either of the conversion or of the extinction of the superhuman enemies of God also. If moral evil cannot continue to exist in man, no more can it continue to exist outside of man. In the passage before us, however, the Apostle does not speak of either the conversion or the extinction of these spirit-forces, but simply of their *καταργεῖσθαι*. This word means not, as a rule, to reduce to non-existence but to render inoperative, to strip of power, *ἀεργὸν ποιεῖσθαι*.¹⁵ And in the case of *ὁ θάνατος* we have a concrete example of how it is meant. *Ὁ θάνατος καταργεῖται* when death is no longer permitted to slay men. This will happen no more after the resurrection. Assuming that *ὁ θάνατος* is not a mere personification but a real daemon-power, one of a genus divided into *ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις*, and assuming that as such Death is assigned to

¹⁵ Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 28; ii. 6; Hebr. ii. 14.

eternal condemnation, there would be nothing inconsistent in all this with the state of the universe in which God is *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι*. And, assuming still further that the wicked of mankind are likewise given up by God to eternal perdition; there is nothing inconsistent in their continuing evil either with the *καταργεῖσθαι* of death or with the *εἶναι τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι* of God. In the Apocalypse it is said that Death and Hades are to be cast into the lake of fire. Yet nobody infers from this that the Apocalypse teaches absolute universalism.

If these two proposals be unacceptable, what is the true interpretation of "all shall be made alive" in vs. 22? Two possibilities offer themselves. The one is to assume that *πάντες* is qualified by *ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ* and by *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*. Charles believes that this construction is indicated by the position of the words. The rendering according to him should be: "As all who are in Adam die, so all who are in Christ shall be made alive". This is a possible view. For analogies Charles refers to 1 Cor. xv. 18, "Those who fell asleep in Christ were lost"; 1 Thess. iv. 16, "the dead in Christ shall rise first"; Col. i. 4, "your faith in Christ Jesus"; Rom. ix. 3, "accursed from Christ". On this view the whole succeeding context deals avowedly with the resurrection of believers only. It is, of course, quite possible to adopt this construction of the words in vs. 22 and its corollary, that the passage confines itself to the resurrection of believers, without endorsing Charles' further inference that Paul taught a resurrection of believers only. There is, however, still a second way in which the same understanding of the passage may be had, and yet the more usual construction of "in Adam" and "in Christ" retained. For even if construing with the verb, we are quite at liberty to assume that Paul made the mental qualification "all (who were in Adam)"—"all (who are in Christ)". We believe this to be the most plausible interpretation of the verse. What the Apostle means to say is not that there is no exception to the dying in Adam and no exception to the being made alive in

Christ, that it involves all individuals, but simply that there is no variation to the mode of these two processes described as "in Adam", "in Christ". In other words, not the universality of the law, but its absolute restriction to one mode of operation is what is affirmed. Vs. 22 serves to elucidate vs. 21 and in the latter verse the point of the statement is, that both death and resurrection are *through a man*. Consequently in vs. 23 not πάντες by itself but πάντες jointly with "in Adam" and "in Christ" has the emphasis: there is no dying outside of Adam, there is no quickening outside of Christ. With absolute universalism this has nothing to do.

The next point raised was that Paul's use of τάγμα implies two stages in the resurrection separated by an interval. This would seem to be the case if the primary meaning of τάγμα must be adhered to. Primarily it stands for "division", "troupe", "group", being used largely as a military term. "Each in his own division" would then imply that there are two "groups" of the raised at least. Now, it is urged, that Christ could not have been conceived by the Apostle as forming a τάγμα by Himself, that consequently the "divisions" implied must exist apart from Christ, in other words that there must be two resurrections following that of Christ. On this view the ἕκαστος does not include Christ but covers only the πάντες of vs. 22, of whom it is said that they will be made alive "in Christ", which latter affirmation could not, of course, apply to Christ Himself. Against the validity of this argumentation we submit, that it is impossible to exclude Christ from the scope of the ἕκαστος. Christ is the ἀπαρχή and ἀπαρχή stands coördinated with ἕπειτα. No plausible reason can be assigned why Paul should have written the clause "the first-fruits Christ" at all, unless he meant to give Christ a place in the order of the resurrection. On the other hand, if we assume that Christ has a τάγμα the reason why His resurrection is introduced here becomes immediately apparent. Probably the circumstance had been urged against the Apostle's doctrine of the

resurrection, that the resurrection of believers ought to take place immediately after their death, at least with no longer delay than intervened between Christ's death and His resurrection. To this the Apostle replies: "Each in his own order": Christ has a prerogative, He is the *ἀπαρχή*, the source of the whole process, therefore His resurrection had to follow without delay, but it is only natural that that of the others should be postponed till His coming, precisely because He is the *ἀπαρχή*. The Apostle, it seems to us, does not use *τάγμα* with any conscious emphasis upon its primary, military meaning, for *ἀπαρχή* belongs to a totally different line of figurative representation, that of the first-fruits and the harvest. Obviously the only point of comparison in the use of *τάγμα* is that of order, sequence of appearance. This leaves it probable that Paul employs the word in its secondary sense of "order": "each in his own order", "each in his own place of succession".¹⁶ This also obviates the difficulty that Christ cannot form a *τάγμα* by Himself. To adhere to the primary sense of "division" and yet include Christ, would be possible only by throwing strong emphasis on the military meaning of the word, so as to represent Christ as "a host in Himself", forming a *τάγμα*, an entire division by His own strength. This might fit the rôle Christ plays in the eschatological process, since in the sequel also He appears as the conqueror over God's enemies. But, as already observed, it is not favored by the characterization of Christ as *ἀπαρχή* rather than as *ἀρχηγός* or some such term. And it certainly does not fit the case of those who form the other *τάγμα*, for believers in their resurrection do not appear in any military capacity.

If then *τάγμα* be given the sense of "order", "rank", and Christ comes in the first *τάγμα*, every necessity falls away for inferring from the mode of statement, that there must be a further *τάγμα* besides that of Christ and that of be-

¹⁶ Cf. 1 Clem xxxvii. 3 Οὐ πάντες εἰσὶν ἑπαρχοὶ οὐδὲ χιλιάρχοι οὐδὲ ἑκατόνταρχοι οὐδὲ πεντηκόνταρχοι οὐδὲ τὸ καθεξῆς, ἀλλ' ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι τὰ ἐπιτασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλείως καὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων ἐπιτελεῖ. Here *τάγμα* = "rank", "position".

lievers, and consequently for finding here the doctrine of a double resurrection, before and after the Millennium.

Much is made of the argument that *εἶτα* at the beginning of vs. 24 proves an interval between the Parousia and "the end". It must be granted that *εἶτα* would be entirely in place, if the Apostle had meant to express such a thought. The contention of Titius, that in that case *ἔπειτα* ought to have been repeated is not borne out by analogy. But it is not true that *εἶτα* is out of place on the other view, *viz.*, if Paul means to affirm mere succession without any protracted interval. *Ἐἶτα* can be used just as well as *τότε* to denote momentary sequence of action, as will be seen from a comparison of vss. 5, 6, 7 in this same chapter, Jno. xiii. 4, 5; xix. 26, 27. Of course a brief interval, in logical conception at least, must be assumed; *τὸ τέλος* comes, strictly speaking, after the rising of *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

The absolute phrase *τὸ τέλος* does not favor the view that "the end of the resurrection" is meant by it. In its absoluteness the simple *τὸ τέλος* is too weighty for this: it must have a more comprehensive meaning. To interpret it of the end of the present aeon is scarcely admissible, for that coincides with the Parousia and by means of *εἶτα* "the end" is represented as a step subsequent to the Parousia. We have the choice between taking it in its strict teleological signification as "the goal" to which the whole process of redemption has been moving, or, if the time-element be retained, understanding it of "the close" of the great eschatological events, which lead over from this aeon into the coming one. The latter is favored by the time-sense of *ὅταν* and the clauses which this conjunction introduces. That which forms as it were the concrete content of the *τέλος* is the giving up of the kingship by Christ to God, the Father. And this "giving up" is nothing else but the culminating result of the eschatological process of subduing the enemies, whence also the second *ὅταν* describes it as taking place after these enemies have been all reduced to subjection. Taking *τέλος* in this sense as marking the con-

summation-point of Christ's eschatological reign, we cannot find in it the proof for a millennium, which it would contain, if it meant "the end of the resurrection". But the question remains, where Paul makes this eschatological reign of Christ, which comes to a close after the resurrection of believers, begin. It is on the answer to this question that the understanding of *εἶτα*, which in itself may mean sequence with or without a chronological interval, in the present case depends. If Paul made this reign of Christ begin at the Parousia then there must be a period between the Parousia and *τὸ τέλος* because the beginning and the end of a thing must be separated in time. If on the other hand the reign dates from a point back of the Parousia, then the *τέλος* of it can follow close upon the Parousia. Here the second *ὅταν*-clause might help us to a decision. It affirms that the giving up of the kingdom will happen after Christ has brought to nought the various powers enumerated. The question resolves itself into this: Is there anything in the conception of these hostile powers and of their subjection which compels us to think of Christ's warfare against and conquest of them as not antedating the Parousia? Plainly the conquest is of such a nature that it covers a period of some duration; this is implied in the *ἄχρῖς οὖ* and in "the last enemy". But the question is, where we shall make the period begin, at the Parousia or at some earlier point. *Ὅταν* is retrospective, but the point to which the retrospect extends is uncertain. All we can say is, that there is nothing in the words of the passage itself, or in Paul's general teaching to hinder us in dating this period of eschatological conquest from the Saviour's death and resurrection. Paul regards these last-named events in an eschatological light. In Col. ii. 15 he speaks of the conquest of the *ἀρχαί* and *ἐξουσίαι* as having been in principle accomplished in the cross of Christ. In Rom. viii. 38, 39 he assumes that even now Christ so reigns over and controls death and life and principalities and powers, that nothing is able any longer to separate believers from the love of God in Him.

But, while the words of the second *ὅταν*-clause will fit into either view, this clause, when taken in connection with the statement of vs. 26, positively favors an earlier beginning of the kingdom of Christ than at the Parousia. "The last enemy that is brought to nought is Death". The conquering of the other enemies, and consequently the reign of Christ, which consists in this, precedes the conquest of Death. Now Paul makes the conquest of Death coincide with the Parousia and the resurrection of believers. According to vss. 50-58, when the dead are raised incorruptible, and the living are changed, (*i. e.* according to vs. 23 at the Parousia) Death is swallowed up in victory. And still further, apart from this specific argument derived from the swallowing up of Death in victory at the Parousia, a more general argument can be built on vss. 50-58, because the resurrection of the righteous and the very last "end" must fall together. In vss. 50-58 the Apostle speaks throughout in terms of absolute consummation. When the righteous dead are raised, this is the moment of their inheriting "the kingdom of God", vs. 50. Notice that the Apostle does not say "the kingdom of Christ", as he ought to have said according to the Chiliastic exegesis of vss. 24-28, for this exegesis makes Paul distinguish between a kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of God in this way, that the former extends from the Parousia till "the end", the latter begins with "the end". Vs. 50 proves that the kingdom of God begins with the Parousia and the resurrection of the righteous, therefore the kingdom of Christ must, so far as it is chronologically distinguished from the kingdom of God, lie before the Parousia; it begins, as already stated, with Christ's own resurrection. This also follows from the equivalence of the *κυριότης* of Christ and the *βασιλεία* of Christ. The *κυριότης* begins with the resurrection of the Saviour, therefore His *βασιλεία* cannot begin at a later point. Phil. ii. 9-11 connects with the exaltation of Christ to the *κυριότης*, the same things that 1 Cor. xv. 24-28 connects with His reign as king. The trump blown for the resurrection of

the righteous is according to vs. 52 "the last trump", which excludes the prospect of any further crisis. Elsewhere also the Apostle joins together, as we have seen, the resurrection of believers, the change of the living, and the judgment of the world.¹⁷ Finally, Paul expects that the renewal of the entire creation will accompany the resurrection of the saints, Rom. viii. 18-22. When the creation is delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God, this of itself must mark the consummation of all things and excludes the further activity of enemies, who would still have to be subjected.

Two other passages sometimes quoted as carrying Chiliastic implications are 1 Thess. iv. 13-18, and 2 Thess. i. 5-12. In regard to the former passage, it is argued that the Thessalonians appear to have been doubtful whether those who had died among them would be raised from the dead at the Parousia. But they cannot have been ignorant of or non-believers in the resurrection of the saints as such, since this latter doctrine holds a central place in Paul's gospel, and he must have preached it to them emphatically. They could not have been Christians without knowing and accepting it. The situation, it is believed, becomes conceivable only, if we understand the doubt or unbelief of the Thessalonians to have had reference not to the resurrection of believers in general, but to the question whether the departed believers would have a resurrection of their own at the Parousia to enable them to share in the provisional kingdom of Christ together with those whom the Lord would find alive at His coming, or whether they would have to wait for their resurrection and glory until the end of this kingdom. It was to them not a question of resurrection or non-resurrection, but a question of earlier or later, and on this question of earlier or later hinged the question of sharing in or missing the blessedness of the millennial kingdom. And that such was the real situation, it is urged, follows not merely from the impossibility of otherwise conceiving it,

¹⁷ Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 19; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 7, 8; 2 Tim. iv. 1.

but also from the manner in which Paul meets it. He does not affirm in general that there is a resurrection of the dead as he does in 1 Cor. xv., but says "those that are fallen asleep, God will through Jesus bring with him". And "we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise *precede* them that are fallen asleep". The use of the verb *φθάνειν* "precede" is taken as proof that the question was a question of precedence. Paul denies the precedence in the peculiar form in which the Thessalonians had imagined it. There will be no earlier or later as regards believers, no discrimination between living and dead as to share in the provisional Messianic kingdom. All will be brought by God to be with Jesus at His coming. But, while denying this, and in the very act of denying this, Paul implies that the general scheme of the resurrection admitted of the possibility of doubt on this point, because there is room for precedence, there are successive stages in it, there will be a dual resurrection, one at the Parousia, another at the close of Christ's millennial reign. The Apostle virtually assures the Thessalonians that their dead will be at the first meeting of the saints with Christ, which distinctly presupposes that there will be a second meeting at a later point.

Here as in the case of 1 Cor. xv. the argument seems to be a very plausible and convincing one. But, when we look more closely at the actual words of the passage, the matter becomes somewhat more complicated and considerably less certain. First of all it should be observed that not much can be built on the *a priori* assumption of the impossibility of the Thessalonians' doubting the resurrection as such after the preaching of Paul. To the Church in Corinth Paul had also preached the resurrection, still some of the members of that church were disbelievers of the doctrine. It is true the doubt of the Thessalonians, if it existed, must have been of a different character, more naïve, less theoretical than that of the Corinthians, otherwise Paul would have met it systematically as he does in 1 Cor. xv. But, if theoretical reasons made the Corinthians skeptical, notwithstanding the explicit

preaching of Paul, then some more primitive or instinctive form of the same Hellenic unbelief may have kept the Thessalonians from assimilating this part of Paul's gospel, of course in a more innocent way, for Paul does not blame, he simply comforts and reassures them. It is not *a priori* impossible that there were those among the Thessalonians who believed the glory of the end to be destined for those only who would be living at the coming of Christ and expected nothing for the dead, neither at the Parousia nor thereafter, neither in the body nor as to the spirit,—in a word, who judged of the dead after a pagan, Hellenic fashion, while taking a Christian view of those whom Christ at His coming would find living in the body.

But the decisive question is: What does the passage itself imply? The very words in which the Apostle introduces the subject seem to us to make it plain that the Thessalonians did not take into account, as a ground for relative disappointment, or relative comfort, a resurrection of their dead at a point later than the Parousia, separated from the latter by an intervening reign of Christ. Vs. 13 indicates that the readers were given to sorrowing over their dead as the pagans do who have no hope. The question has been raised, it is true, whether this necessarily means that they sorrowed for the same reason for which the pagans sorrow, *viz.*, that they had no hope whatever, not even of ultimate belated resurrection, or whether justice be not done to the words when we merely make them mean, that the Thessalonians sorrowed in the same excessive manner as the Gentiles do, although each for a different reason, the Gentiles because they have no hope, the Thessalonians because they feared that their dead would not return to life until after the Messianic reign of Christ, with all its possibilities for enjoyment, was hopelessly past. It has been argued that Paul distinguishes the case of the Thessalonians from that of the *λοιποί*; the *λοιποί* are *οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα*; they, therefore, must be *ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα*; consequently Paul does not class them with disbelievers concerning the resurrection; the manner or

excess of their sorrow only was the same as that of the pagans, not the reason was the same. This argumentation, however, overlooks the fact that the *ἐλπίδα ἔχειν*, which certainly is implied with reference to the readers, is not an *ἐλπίδα ἔχειν* in their subjective consciousness, but in the objective conviction of Paul. The Apostle does not mean to say: You need not *have* sorrowed, because you *knew* you had hope. What he means to say is: You *need* not sorrow, because I know there is hope for you. These words, therefore, do not help us in any way to determine the subjective state of mind of the Thessalonians, whether they doubted merely the raising of their dead at the Parousia or the raising of their dead at any time. Decisive, however, are the following considerations: (1) The *καί* before *οἱ λοιποί* indicates that the Thessalonians in their own mind *also* belonged to the class of those who had no hope; if the mere manner or degree of sorrowing formed the point of comparison, Paul would have written *καθὼς οἱ λοιποί*. (2) The way in which Paul explains himself in vs. 14 shows how he conceived of the subjective state of mind of the Thessalonians. It will be noticed that in this verse he really gives two assurances: (a) that the *κοιμηθέντες* will be raised; (b) that they will be brought by God into the presence of Jesus at the Parousia. This sounds as if both points had been in doubt. If only the latter had been in doubt, Paul would have said: The resurrection will take place not later but at the Parousia. What he says is: There will be a resurrection of the dead, and the dead will be present at the Parousia. Especially the protasis of vs. 14, "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose" make this very clear, because logically it requires the apodosis: "then also those that are fallen asleep will rise in Christ". That Jesus rose Paul would not have mentioned at all, if there had not been doubt concerning the fact of the resurrection. The apodosis which Paul actually wrote does not show our point so clearly, because it contracts into a single clause two distinct propositions: *ὁ θεὸς τοὺς κοιμηθέντας ἐγερεῖ διὰ τοῦ*

Ἰησοῦ and ὁ θεὸς τοὺς κοιμηθέντας ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ. (3)

If the Thessalonians had been merely concerned about a belated participation of their dead in the blessings of the future, and Paul had wished to call attention to the relative hopefulness of even this state of mind as contrasted with the utter hopelessness of the pagan attitude on the subject, then the Apostle would as a matter of fact have given the Thessalonians two distinct grounds of comfort; in the *first* place that even so their doubt did not call for such excessive sorrow, since they themselves continued to believe in an ultimate resurrection; in the *second* place that the actual situation was far better than they imagined, since they could count on an immediate resurrection coinciding with the Parousia. But in reality there is no trace that Paul had two such distinct thoughts in mind; vs. 14 by means of γάρ attaches itself to vs. 13, but it makes no reflection upon the main thought which would according to the Chiliastic exegesis find expression in vs. 13, *viz.*, that the Thessalonians had at any rate the final resurrection to fall back upon.

On the ground of these three considerations it may be confidently affirmed that the sorrow of the Thessalonians had no Chiliastic background, but was caused by more fundamental misconceptions. Still this yields no more than a negative result. It cannot be proved from their state of mind that they were Chiliasts and that Paul had taught them such doctrine. Notwithstanding this the possibility exists that in the answer which Paul gives in order to instruct or relieve them, there might be Chiliastic implications. The general doubt of the Thessalonians, whether their dead would be present at the Parousia, Paul might have met in the more precise form of implying that they would not only participate in the resurrection but would obtain a first resurrection restricted to believers. In other words, the writing of this very passage might have been the first occasion on which Paul broached the subject of the provisional kingdom to the Thessalonian converts. This brings us to

the question how the *φθάσωμεν* in vs. 15 is to be understood. The verb expresses the thought of arriving earlier at the goal than somebody else. How is this to be understood in the connection? Did Paul have in mind when he used this figure that there were two distinct arrivals at the presence of the Lord and at the resurrection-state, the earlier and the later, and does he assure the Thessalonians that those who remained alive would not have the earlier one and the dead in Christ only the later of these two arrivals? In that case the background is that of Chiliasm with its double resurrection. Or did Paul simply employ the figure to assure the readers that in gaining the presence of the Lord the dead would not be *a moment* behind the living? In that case the representation has nothing to do with Chiliasm. It seems to us that everything is in favor of the latter exegesis. The Chiliastic scheme distinguishes between two resurrections, but not between two resurrections to glory, so that it really does not explain the mode of expression: those that are left will not anticipate the dead. Of an anticipation in glory the Chiliastic scheme knows only where the first resurrection is confined to the martyrs, and that could not be the case here, since Paul speaks of all the dead in Christ.¹⁸

In 2 Thess. i. 5-12 there occur two expressions which have been construed in a Chiliastic sense. In vss. 5ff. the Apostle says that the persecutions and afflictions which the

¹⁸ It is a question in dispute which will probably never be settled to satisfaction how much of vss. 15-17 belongs to the *λόγος κυρίου* which Paul quotes and with what degree of literalness it is quoted by him. If we were sure that the words in v. 15 *οἱ περιλειπόμενοι οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας* (with the change, of course, from the 1st to the 3rd person) were literally Christ's words, either orally transmitted or by revelation delivered to Paul, then it would be plain, that to draw the inference of Chiliasm from *φθάσωμεν* would involve not merely the ascription of this doctrine to Paul but likewise to Jesus. But it is scarcely worth while for our present purpose to pursue this any further, because we have no data to determine the extent and the literalness of the quotation. The words of Jesus might merely have affirmed the resurrection of the believing dead at the Parousia, and Paul might have made use of this declaration in an argument with Chiliastic implications.

members of the Church endure are a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, to the end that they may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God for which they also suffer, since it is a righteous thing with God to recompense affliction to them that afflict the readers and to those that are afflicted rest with Paul at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven. In vs. 11 we have the more general idea, that God may count the Thessalonians worthy of their calling (*κλησις* here in the objective sense = "that to which one is called, as *ἐλπὶς* elsewhere). There is, however, nothing in these statements that would go beyond the general thought that suffering and glory, sanctification and inheritance of the kingdom of God are linked together. The persecutions and afflictions of which the former passage speaks are not specifically those of martyrdom, and to think of a separate resurrection for all those that were persecuted and afflicted, would be without analogy. Besides this, the kingdom to which Paul refers is "the kingdom of God" (vs. 5), and this, according to 1 Cor. xv. 24, is the kingdom of the absolute end, not the intermediate kingdom preceding it.¹⁹

The last passage we must examine as to its bearings on the question of Chiliasm in Paul is Phil. iii. 10-14. The Apostle it is said, here expresses the desire to become conformed into the death of Christ, that is to suffer martyrdom. The motive for this desire is expressed in the words "if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead". Paul according to this interpretation expected a resurrection in which only those who had died for Christ's sake would share, whereas the others would have to be content with the

¹⁹ Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 12 "to the end that ye should walk worthily of God, who calleth you into his own kingdom and glory". It will be observed that if the passage from 1 Thess. iv. discussed above, and the expressions in 2 Thess. i. both taught Chiliasm, they would disagree as to the type of Chiliasm taught, since the First Epistle implies that all believers who have died share in the resurrection at the Parousia, whereas the Second Epistle would restrict this privilege to those who have endured persecution. This might be construed as a reflection on the genuineness of the Second Epistle.

general resurrection at a later time. This, it will be observed, would yield a conception far more analogous to what Chiliastic interpreters find in the well-known passage of the Apocalypse than the statements of 1 Cor. xv. 22ff, Chiliastically interpreted, for here in Philippians we should actually have the idea that the martyrs receive as a special reward a resurrection preceding that of the others, whereas, according to 1 Cor., all those that are of Christ would at His coming share in the resurrection.²⁰

Unfortunately in the Epistle to the Philippians it is more impossible than anywhere else to reconcile the alleged Chiliastic elements with the fundamental structure of the writer's eschatology. According to Chap. iii. 20, 21 Paul makes the Parousia coincident with the change of body not merely for himself but for all: "For our commonwealth is in heaven, from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself". If Paul expected any special privilege for himself and other martyrs as regards the time and order of resurrection it cannot have been in connection with the Parousia. We should then have to assume that he looked forward to an earlier resurrection, perhaps immediately after death. On such a view it would perhaps be

²⁰The difference between the Chiliasm found in Apoc. xx, 4 and that found in 1 Cor. xv. 22ff. relates to several other points: The Apocalypse makes the reign of Christ last one thousand years, Paul in 1 Cor. would speak of an indefinitely protracted period. According to the Apocalypse at the close of the one thousand years during which Satan is bound he is let loose again previously to his final conquest by Christ; in 1 Cor. the close of the millennial period signifies the conquering of the last enemy. In the Apocalypse the conflict between Christ and the enemies is concentrated in the crisis at the end, with Paul it would cover the whole period of Christ's kingdom. The millennial reign which according to the Apocalypse would be a reign of peace, Satan being bound, would be a reign of war on the interpretation put on Paul's words. It is usually assumed that the millennial reign of which the Apocalypse is believed to speak, is a reign to be exercised by Christ on earth, the process of which Paul speaks plays itself out in the transcendental sphere.

possible to explain the plural of vss. 20, 21 rhetorically so as not to include Paul himself, and confirmation might be found for that in the first chapter, where "to depart" is equivalent to "being with Christ". Thus at least a degree of consistency could be saved for the Epistle. But even such a modified form of the anticipated-resurrection theory would not be plausible enough to deserve serious consideration. On the one hand it is unnatural to exclude Paul from the *ἡμεῖς* of iii. 20, 21; on the other hand there is nothing in i. 20-24 to suggest that the Apostle conceived of the "being with Christ", to which his death would immediately introduce him, as an embodied life in heaven. It is true the phrase *σὺν κυρίῳ εἶναι* designates in 1 Thess. iv. 17 the presence with Christ in the body after the resurrection, but in that passage it receives its special meaning from the context, as is indicated by the word *οὕτως* "and thus we shall be forever with the Lord". In our passage the *σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι* does not have its meaning contextually determined in this way. The phrase in itself decides nothing as to the form which the presence with Christ will assume. Nothing hinders and everything favors giving it the same meaning as the *ἐνδημησαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον* of 2 Cor. v. 8.

Another serious objection to the Chiliastic interpretation lies in the expressions of vs. 12. Here Paul speaks of that which would enable him to *καταντᾶν εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν* as an "apprehending" a "having been made perfect", and denies his having attained to this: "Not that I have already apprehended or am already made perfect: but I press on, if so be that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended by Christ Jesus". It is plain from this that the condition on which the Apostle suspends his attaining unto the resurrection cannot be martyrdom, for it would have no sense for him to assure the readers, that he had not yet attained this, nor was as yet in this way made perfect. Some internal process of attainment and perfecting must be referred to. As soon as we understand the words describing the condition of attaining unto the resur-

rection of an internal process, they appear to be identical in meaning with other statements of the Apostle which affirm the causal nexus between suffering here on earth with Christ and glorification with Him hereafter, and in which it is recognized by all that the reference is not to any special privilege granted to a class of believers, but to the general grace of the resurrection-glory in store for all believers.²¹

Now the difficulty arises that on this interpretation Paul seems to make his participation in the resurrection of believers, which elsewhere appears as an assured possession of every Christian, contingent upon a certain process which he is undergoing here on earth. How could he speak, one naturally asks, of his resurrection with the dubiousness implied in the words: "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead"? In order to relieve this difficulty Van Hengel in his Commentary on the Epistle proposes the following interpretation.²² The word *ἐξανάστασις*, he thinks, does not mean here Paul's own resurrection, but is a designation for the time when the Parousia takes place, equivalent to "the hour of the resurrection". Paul would then with a degree of dubiousness express the hope or wish, that, as a result of his striving after conformity with Christ, he might be permitted by God to attain unto, that is to survive until the day of the resurrection. But this is an impossible exegesis for several reasons. Why should Paul call the day of the Parousia by this name "the resurrection from the dead", if he himself wishes or hopes to survive, so that to him personally it would not be a day of resurrection? Going outside of his usual terminology to give it a strange name, he would at least have chosen a name that had some application to his own personal case. And

²¹ Cf. Rom. viii. 17 "If so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him"; 2 Cor. iv. 10 "Bearing always about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh"; 2 Tim. ii. 12 "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him."

²² *Commentarius perpetuus in Ep. Pauli ad Philippenses*, 1838, pp. 234ff.

in the first chapter of the Epistle Paul shows very plainly that survival until the Parousia did no longer at the time of writing appear to him so desirable a thing as to be the supreme goal of his aspiration. He there declares "to depart and be with Christ very far better" than "to abide in the flesh".²³

We are thus compelled to face the fact that *ἐξανάστασις* means Paul's own resurrection at the Parousia, and that the Apostle represents this by means of *εἶ πως καταντήσω* as in a sense dependent on the outcome of his whole Christian striving and living as it revolved around the apprehension of Christ and the conformation to His death. This may be an unusual representation, but we have no right to declare it impossible. From one point of view, of course, the resurrection was absolutely certain to the Apostle, *viz.*, from the point of view of the divine purpose as reflected in the believer's assurance of salvation. But from another point of view the same resurrection could appear none the less as the ethically and religiously conditioned acme of the believer's progress in grace and conformity to Christ. The best way to make this plain to ourselves is to keep in mind the two-fold attitude in which the Apostle places himself towards the other great eschatological fact, that of the judgment. On the one hand in the doctrine of justification he posits the absolute certainty that this judgment must be one of complete absolution and vindication on the basis of the merit of Christ. On the other hand he looks forward to the final judgment with a strong sense of accountability and fear, such as makes the thought of it a potent factor in his daily conduct. The sanctification of the believer is to him the *sine qua non* of the divine approval in that day. This throws light upon the analogous representation of the resurrection as the goal of a process of ever-growing apprehension and reproduction of Christ. As no one can expect to

²³ Van Hengel thinks that the verb *καταντῶν* requires the interpretation of "pervenire ad tempus hujus eventi". But he overlooks the fact that the choice of the verb is determined by the figure of "striving", as in the sequel *διώκειν*. It is obviously metaphorical.

stand in the last day who has not practiced holiness in the fear of God, so no one can hope to attain unto the resurrection of life who has not learned to know Christ and the power of His resurrection and fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed unto His death. Such a mode of viewing the resurrection need not do away with the other mode of viewing it as a gift of free grace, bestowed for the sake of the merit of Christ. The first relation in which Paul stands to Christ is expressed in vss. 8, 9: "That I may win Christ and be found in him, not having my own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith". This is the forensic relation of justification and it is fundamental. But this is followed by a second, that of the apprehension of Christ subjectively in sanctification. And that it is not impossible for Paul to represent the resurrection as a goal to be striven after, appears from the fact that he here plainly so represents the present spiritual resurrection, which elsewhere he views quite as much as the bodily resurrection under the aspect of an absolute act or gift of God. The process of "knowing Christ", particularly of "knowing the power of his resurrection", is subject to a *διώκειν* on the Apostle's part. It is at one and the same time a divine grace and a Christian attainment. It is a *γνώσις* in which Paul takes an active part, in which there is place for a *καταλαβείν*, just as there is a *καταντᾶν* with reference to the eschatological resurrection. It is not necessary here to explain, and may not be easy to explain in the concrete, precisely how the Apostle conceived of this. The only point we desire to make is that if the terms of effort are appropriate terms to be used in connection with the spiritual resurrection, then we have no right to say that *καταντᾶν εἰς* used with *εἰ πως* involves an impossible representation from Paul's point of view as regards the resurrection of the body at the last day. Possibly in vs. 14 "the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" likewise designates the resurrection-experience or the resurrection-state as something to which God will

call at the end, or as something which lies ready in heaven as the goal to which the believer has been called. Now of this prize Paul affirms that he presses on towards it as towards a goal, and of all mature Christians (τέλειοι) he expects that they will be "thus minded", that is assume the same attitude of pursuit.

We have completed our exegetical survey, and the conclusion is that in none of the passages adduced in favor of the hypothesis is the alleged Chiliasm borne out by the facts, while in not a few points it is positively irreconcilable with the Apostle's representation. It ought to be remembered, however, that this result of our investigation concerns only the idea of a provisional Messianic kingdom as *future*, strictly eschatological from Paul's own standpoint, beginning with the Parousia of the Lord. The argument in no wise precludes Paul's having regarded the *present* reign of Christ with its semi-eschatological character, beginning with the Saviour's resurrection and exaltation to the *κυριότης* in the light of a provisional kingdom to be succeeded by the absolute kingdom at the Parousia. In point of fact such a representation is found in the passage of 1 Cor. xv., for here we are told in so many words that at "the end" Christ will deliver up the kingdom to God, the Father, which implies plainly a distinction between the kingdom of Christ as a present and the kingdom of God as a future reality. Here then we have a form in which the Apostle has incorporated into his eschatology the idea of the two-fold kingdom, just as in the teaching of our Lord there is something analogous to this idea in the distinction between the present kingdom and the eschatological kingdom. And it will be observed that in this form and in this form only is the distinction exempt from the objection we had above to urge against the theory of a future millennial kingdom separating the present state of believers from their absolute consummation in heaven, *viz.*, that it would represent an anti-climax and interpose something where the whole tenor of the Pauline teaching requires absolute continuity. On

our interpretation the Messianic provisional kingdom and the present *σωτηρία* are identical and coextensive, so that what the Christian now possesses and enjoys is the first-fruits and pledge of the life eternal. If a future Messianic kingdom were to be assumed, we should have to say that to the eschatological aspiration of the Christian, as Paul everywhere depicts it, it is a negligible quantity, for this aspiration everywhere fastens, without any intermediate resting-point, on the eternal state. This is immediately explained, if the blessings and joys of the Messianic reign have already arrived, so that the Christian hope can with undivided intensity project itself into the world to come.

On the other hand it cannot be said that Paul carries through this distinction between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of God with uniformity. While to a larger extent an eschatological conception with Paul than with Jesus, the kingdom of God is not exclusively so in the Pauline teaching. The Apostle speaks of "inheriting" the kingdom of God, 1 Cor. vi. 9; xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; believers are called to God's kingdom and glory, 1 Thess. ii. 12; they suffer that they may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, 2 Thess. i. 5, 7. But the kingdom of God also appears as a present reality, thus in Rom. xiv. 17, where it is said not to consist in eating and drinking but in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit, and in 1 Cor. iv. 20, where its essence is placed not in word, but in power.²⁴ Here accordingly the kingdom of God and the present reign of Christ are identified. And if the present kingdom can be called the kingdom of God, it is also to be noticed that the future kingdom can be called the kingdom of Christ. This occurs in Eph. v. 5, where Paul speaks of an "inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God", and in 2 Tim. iv. 1, where we read of the *ἐπιφανεῖα* and the *βασιλεία* of the Lord Jesus Christ as coinciding with the judgment. This has been brought into connection with the

²⁴ Cf. also 1 Cor. iv. 8 and Col. iv. 11.

advanced doctrine of the later Epistles, where Christ is distinctly represented as the goal of the world-movement.²⁵

The above observations show that a hard and fast distinction between a Messianic kingdom and the kingdom of God is not found in Paul. Obviously what has invited the distinction in 1 Cor. xv. is the fact that here the reign of Christ appears in one specific aspect, *viz.*, as a reign of conquest. The βασιλεύειν of Christ here virtually consists in the process of subduing one enemy after the other. As such it naturally enters into contrast with the absolute, eternal reign of God at the end, of which it is characteristic that from it all enemies and warfare have been eliminated. It may lend confirmation to this that Col. i. 13, the one passage besides 1 Cor. xv. 24, which explicitly calls the present order of things the kingdom of Christ, has the same militant background: God has delivered us out of the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love, although here the conqueror, who rescues from the enemy, is rather God than Christ.²⁶

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

²⁵ Cf. *Enc. Bibl.* ii, 1386.

²⁶ If one were to look for analogies to the Pauline conception among the apocalyptic references to the provisional kingdom, the vision of weeks of Enoch could be most easily compared, for here the Messianic period is characterized as "the period of the sword". Of course this is meant in quite a different sense from that which Paul puts upon the warfare of Christ.